



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

itself. It is cowardly to seek refuge in qualifications. It is false to the banner of Christ. Christ is the great adventurer. He prefers the chances of the cross to the certainties of the twelve legions of angels. Let us follow him."

But still the objector, the ardent patriot who considers himself alone the safeguard of his country, presses us. There are some things no nation would consent to arbitrate. Perhaps so, but it is hard to name any that any other nation would expect us to arbitrate concerning which the other nation would not take equal chances with ourselves. "But our honor may be touched. The existing treaties should specifically exempt matters which concern our honor, vital interests, or independence." Now, of course, it is preposterous to think that our independence would be called in question. But what do honor and vital interests mean when urged by the objector. They mean only this: that we hold in reserve as not capable of arbitration what *we* think concerns our honor. It is here again that the Christian view interposes itself. There is no such thing as honor in a man unless it is righteous honor. The only honor any man or any nation can have is the honor of being right. And if we are right, why do we need to fear an impartial court? Why do we need to think our honor is not maintained by putting our case before a great tribunal? As has been pointed out, England felt her honor touched in the Alabama claims; but at last she consented to arbitration. Justice, as we think, was done. England yielded, and does any Christian man dare say that it was not more honorable for her to yield to the decision than to fight? "Would we submit," one fiery warrior has asked, "to having our ships searched, as in 1812?" Assuredly not (even if such an absurd supposition may be allowed for the argument's sake); but if we protested and brought the case to arbitration, what more honorable thing could we do?

For the Christian, at any rate, this appeal to careful judicial decision, this opportunity for calm consideration, must be the only kind of appeal worth considering. He knows that might never settled right, and he knows that right alone makes honor.

Exactly the same may be said of the plea of the distinguished citizen who a few years ago received the Nobel Prize for his services to the peace cause, that the peace of righteousness is the only peace worth having. All Christian men will agree in that judgment; but as the protagonist of righteousness develops his theme, it appears that one fundamental Christian virtue is forgotten—the virtue of humility. So far as one can understand his reasoning, it is that a righteous peace is one which we enforce according to our own standards. "Righteousness and our national policy," as has been well said, "appear to be synonymous in his mind."

The entire plea forgets the other side. It assumes that we can trust no one else to see moral values aright; that humility, which alone leads man or nation into true righteousness, is completely denied. God's revelation is limited to a chosen race. It is the baldest skepticism in masquerade. It leads inevitably to the doctrine that might makes right. The big stick is the natural weapon of the skeptic.

But all that is not Christianity. Christianity believes in peace. It believes only in righteous peace; but it believes equally that the way to get righteous peace

is by moral means, by appeal to the best in man, by trust and confidence, by bringing to bear all that facts and reason can show, in order that justice may be established. It may be, as the President has well said, that now and then arbitration will "bite." We may lose even when our claim is just, but that is honorable defeat. It is righteous defeat. Shall we take no risks? I say again that Christianity is a religion of risks. It has the sublime courage which trusts in righteousness and truth. It will dare the chances of the cross rather than rest upon the certainties of the twelve legions of angels. In a word, Christianity will strive to bring the nations to the consistent acceptance of the very principles which underlie their growing democracy. Democracy is the political expression of Christianity. It is founded upon faith in man. It could not live a moment except upon faith.

The Christian church, then, if she understands her own fundamental principles, must support the peace movement, not only by presenting an ideal, but by urging the substitution of trust for suspicion, of the courage of faith for the courage born of the great armament, of the humility which may own the possibility of being wrong for the pride which confuses one's own position with eternal righteousness.

It is precisely the peace of righteousness which Christianity seeks. To secure that, it will call other nations brothers, and trust them. It will put aside suspicion. It will take chances. It will have the courage of faith. It will refuse to call for the twelve legions of angels.

The great and terrible indictment against Christianity in this matter of world peace against hundreds of thousands of ministers and millions of Christian people, is that they are afraid. Let us be afraid no longer. Let us trust God and humanity.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

World Peace.

By Sister M. Fides Shepperson.

It is a pleasurable relief for the serious student of history to lift his eyes from the blood-red records of the past, and let them turn with kindlier hope toward the Peace Palace of The Hague, the Knox anticipative International Court of Arbitral Justice, the glorious possibilities for world peace that lie potential in the late kingly gift of Andrew Carnegie, and the unconditional peace treaties recently agreed upon by the representatives of three leading nations of the world—our own country, France, and England—and now awaiting the ratification of the Senate.

Will wars cease? *No*, thunders the past; not yet, says the present; yes, whispers the future.

And yet, whatever the outcome, the third of August, 1911—the day of the signing of the treaties—will stand as a red-letter day in the annals of history. The well-known picture portraying the signing of the treaties will, sooner or later, take its place among the influences of enduring good. The gratified smile of President Taft, the tense interest of the witnesses, the rugged earnestness of England's representative, Ambassador Bryce, and of our own Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox, and atmospherically o'er all and in all, the tremendous significance and age-deep interests there represented make the picture unique.

THE TREATY.

The pivotal difference between the present arbitration treaties and all preceding treaties is that in the present treaties the so-called *questions of vital interest and honor* are divested of their shadowy verbiage and dangerous equivocation and Don Quixote possibilities, and made to take and keep their place in the calm classification *justiciable*. Given a grievance, a hot-headed cabinet, a jingoistic press, and any nation may waken in surprise on a calm morning to find itself ere night hot with war fever at the phantom call of some "question of vital interest or honor." As of old, in the days of absolutism, there was still hope in the appeal from "Philip drunk to Philip sober," so a treaty anticipative of arbitration makes possible an appeal from a nation in wrath to a nation in reason.

LET THE ARBITRATION TREATIES BE RATIFIED
UNCHANGED.

Hon. Richard Bartholdt, in his speech before the House of Representatives soon after the treaties were sent to the Senate, urged that they should be ratified unchanged by the Senate. A few telling sentences from his able address may fittingly find place here.

In refuting the objections to the treaty, Mr. Bartholdt says: "Not one of the arguments advanced against ratification, whether based upon selfishness and prejudice or inspired by honest and conscientious scruples, is tenable in the face of the public weal and the sum total of human happiness which these international agreements will vouchsafe. Shall the capitalist who builds our battleships and the militarist whose profession is war be called in to decide the pending questions for us, or shall we be guided by considerations of 'the greatest good for the greatest number'?"

Mr. Bartholdt denies that our German-American citizens are opposed to the treaties. To quote: "The great National German-American Alliance, counting 2,000,000 citizens of this country as its members, has sent an appeal to the people of Germany asking them to induce their government to join the league of peace by negotiating, the same as Great Britain and France have done, an arbitration treaty with the United States. I think that fact disposes of every doubt as to where the German-Americans stand on this great question."

As a logical argument the speaker urges: "If judicial decisions are right nationally, why not also internationally? And have you ever given thought to the contradictory position of a nation which compels its citizens to go to court for the redress of wrongs, forbidding them to take the law in their own hands, but refuses this rule of conduct itself by resorting, or maintaining the right to resort, to violence and war in the prosecution of its alleged rights?"

Mr. Bartholdt upholds the treaty just as it is, and defends specially the appointing of a joint high commission of inquiry, though he acknowledges that the power of decision given to this body may, in actual practice, infringe upon the constitutional right of the Senate. Yet he adds wisely: "Each nation is jealous of its sovereignty, and with European rulers particularly this is sacred ground. Yet the great cause of the world's peace has wrung concession after concession from them, and the great and holy purpose to be subserved will, let us hope, also induce our Senate to subor-

dinate technicalities to the common good of the human family. Certain it is, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot eat the cake and have it, too. In other words, we cannot enter into international agreements and at the same time maintain intact in every respect what is called sovereign power or senatorial prerogative. As the individual surrenders natural rights in order to live in a community of individuals, so a nation must sacrifice some part of its sovereignty in order to meet the obligations imposed by agreements with the family of nations. And remember that it is a sacrifice solely in the interest of the common welfare, in behalf of the greatest boon of all the nations—their peace."

THE PAST.

The story of our forefathers, whether immediate or remote, historic or prehistoric, is not one of which we, their descendants, may justly feel proud. Whatever awaits the human race, its record, since the Golden Age at least, is not to its credit. The historic pages of Egypt, of Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, the Byzantine Empire, the Empire of the West, the Middle Age period, the modern, the recent, seem utterly at variance with a concluding chapter—Peace.

In the beginning of time, so mythology records, there were giants with snaky tails and scaly bodies and human heads; and there were mermaids, cold fish-maidens, with sunny, streaming hair: but they were abnormal, monstrous, impossible. The Olympian deities fought long and fiercely against the giants, and finally conquered. Today the snarling governments of nations, tricked out in the headgear of peace and trailing scaly armaments of snaky Dreadnaughts, are as monstrous as the mythic giants. Yet when the peoples of these nations as a whole shall have been brought up to a full knowledge and deep appreciation and sincere desire of world peace, then they, *Demos*, as Olympian deities, shall fight valiantly against the giants and the Typhon and the Titans, and shall destroy them and shall rule over all the peoples of the earth from a brotherly world-Olympus.

The text-books of history, the school readers, the libraries, the schools and colleges of the country, the pulpit and press of the world are the potent agencies which can with time so educate the masses that war will be impossible: but until that uplift shall have come to nations as a whole, in vain will poets rave about world peace and philosophers philosophize and statesmen fancifully frame international treaties of arbitration.

LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS.

The book so far most effective in the interests of world peace was written by a woman. Baroness von Suttner, in her powerful war romance, "Lay Down Your Arms," has blazed a trail to the dark abode of Mars. Others will follow and go farther; they will enter the abode; they will see the horrid war god face to face; and ultimately they will drag him out from his age-long shrine and expose his hideousness to all the world but *Dux facti femina* (The leader was a woman).

The book deals with the period of the Bismarckian wars and the author follows that tortuous bit of history with the feelings of a thinker, truth-seeker, moralist, woman, wife, and mother. Baroness von Suttner took part in the scenes she describes; and she relates, with

the straight force of truth, what she saw and felt, and what the members of the esoteric war-ring saw and felt; and gruesomely, above all, what the wounded soldier-survivors on the blood-red battlefield of Königgrätz (Sadowa) saw and felt. Ah! surely if the battle-wounded, battle-slain of all the weary ages could speak to the nations today, they would say, in the words and in the spirit of the great book of peace, *Lay Down Your Arms!*

Pope Pius X, in a letter addressed to the papal legate at Washington, gives his blessing to the peace movement of the world. His Holiness dwells with special delight upon the tangible strivings after world peace as embodied in the arbitration treaties. The full text of the missive was given in a bulletin recently issued by the American Association for International Conciliation, New York.

Doubtless an international newspaper, with headquarters in London and representatives at every court of the world, would be most efficacious in the cause of peace. By giving publicity to the grievances as soon as they arise, the matter would be at once transferred for decision from the possible chicanery of national cabinets into the calm light of world opinion. The war clouds would be dissipated before they could effectually gather.

THE PRESENT.

But truth is truth, and the deed done is ever decisively victor over the deed undone, and facts versus theories—in spite of the epigram, “So much the worse for the facts”—still continue to occupy the place paramount over theories. And no statesman accurately sweeping the historic cycle from battles by the Nile to the battle by the Sea of Japan can honestly believe that the hour has yet come—

“When the war-drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled

In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.”

The uncertainty of the human element, the magnetic madness potential in personalities, the varying stages of civilization among nations, racial prejudice, the clash of commercial interests, fanaticism, religious hatred, occult influences of evil, the inevitable dualism of the heart of man—all these forces have imperatively demanded and obtained outlet in war through the long course of ages. These forces are with us today.

THE FUTURE.

If the individual is today the sum total of all his yesterdays, so is the human race. And that law holds for the future just as inevitably as it held for the past. Every word spoken for the cause of world peace in righteousness, every article written, every book published, every drama presented, song sung, or treaty signed, takes its place silently and symmetrically amid the intangible forces which shall ultimately erect a house not made with hands, a glorious peace palace of righteousness. It will come.

As in the story of “The Great Stone Face,” Hawthorne’s little classic, the boy Ernest, by long and lovingly gazing upon the benign rock-image overlooking the valley, became himself the man of prophecy, the one who should make the world better because he lived, the living image of the Great Stone Face: so the na-

tions, having ever before them in song and drama and pulpit and press the sublime image of World Peace, shall ultimately become like that which they contemplate. The golden morrow, secure on foundations of earnest todays, shall have as Parthenon of its Acropolis a temple not made with hands, an impalpable peace palace of righteousness refulgent from the heart of the world.

MT. MERCY ACADEMY, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Correspondence.

Editor Advocate of Peace:

SIR: As I have just returned from a three months’ trip to Japan and the Far East, perhaps friends of peace in the United States will be interested in the following incident, which has its bearings on matters here.

While in Tokyo, the Rev. Gilbert Bowles, perhaps the best-informed pacifist in Asia, and the foreign secretary of the Japan Peace Society, showed me a letter from the secretary of the Peace Society, with headquarters at Melbourne, Australia, in which it was stated that an infamous campaign of slander was being waged in some of the Australian papers against Japan, who was accused of having designs against the territorial integrity of the Commonwealth. The peace secretary in Australia begged the peace secretary in Japan to obtain expressions of opinion from some of the leading Japanese and foreign residents of the country, which he could use in Australia to confute these calumnies.

Mr. Bowles asked me, as president of the last American Peace Congress, to contribute to the symposium. I did not keep a copy of my letter, but in substance I replied about as follows:

“I have come to Japan chiefly for the purpose of learning all I can about the foreign policy of Japan with especial reference to the peace of the world. I have discussed this with almost everybody I have met—high government officials, educators, business men, missionaries, fellow-journalists, etc. But in all these conversations the word Australia had never once been mentioned. This would seem to show that if Japan has secret designs on Australia they are so secret that not a living soul, either pro-Japanese or anti-Japanese, has even thought of mentioning it to me. Before I came to Japan I heard from certain American alarmists (not to use a harsher word) that Japan was surely going to seize the Philippines, Hawaii, and the Pacific slope—though for what purpose I could never find out. In Manchuria I was told by some that Japan would surely be obliged to fight Russia again some day. In China it was not infrequently charged that the integrity of the empire was about to be violated by the ‘pigmies’ from the Land of the Rising Sun. If Australia has now entered the ‘charmed circle’ of nations about to be eaten up by Japan, it is evident that either the International Armament syndicate has extended its operations to the Antipodes or else yellow journalism is flourishing in Australia like the rabbits. Australia needs no great navy or universal conscription law to save herself from Japan.”

Such, in brief, was my reply. The truth is, Japan’s one hope and prayer at the present moment is to be let